UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ROBERT CHRISTOPHER REILLY III and SUZANNE DOROTHY REILLY,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BRIAN T. MOYNIHAN, et al.,

Defendants.

2:10-CV-1005 JCM (RJJ)

ORDER

Presently before this court is plaintiffs Robert and Suzanne Reilly's ("plaintiffs") motion for preliminary injunction. (Doc. #6). Plaintiffs previously moved this court for a temporary restraining order. (Doc. #3). This court denied plaintiffs' motion for temporary restraining order on July 1, 2010. (Doc. #8). As in their motion for temporary restraining order, plaintiffs omit crucial information from their motion for preliminary injunction.

Although plaintiffs request the court to enter a preliminary injunction order against defendants, plaintiffs fail to inform the court exactly what they seek to enjoin defendants from doing. However, a preliminary injunction order is still not appropriate even if the court assumes plaintiffs seek to enjoin defendants from foreclosing on plaintiffs' property.

As with a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction requires that the plaintiffs establish: (1) the likelihood of success on the merits; (2) irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief; (3) balance of equities tipped in plaintiffs' favor; and (4) the injunction be in the public interest. *Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, __U.S.__, 129 S. Ct. 365, 374

1	(2008). Additionally, plaintiffs must demonstrate a threat of immediate and irreparable injury, loss,
2	or damages when seeking a preliminary injunction order. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 65.
3	Here, plaintiffs are unlikely to succeed on the merits. Plaintiffs provide little or no legal
4	support for the majority of their arguments. Additionally, it appears that plaintiffs have stopped
5	making payments on their mortgage loans, and the balance of equities therefore does not tip in their
6	favor.
7	Accordingly,
8	IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiffs Robert and Suzanne
9	Reilly's motion for preliminary injunction (Doc. #6) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.
10	DATED August 2, 2010.
11	
12	Xellus C. Mahan
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
an	2

Case 2:10-cv-01005-JCM-RJJ Document 12 Filed 08/02/10 Page 2 of 2

James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge